

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF HAWAII

HELEN GUNDRAN,

Filer,

v.

ZALDY UGALINO, *et al.*,

Named Non-Filers.

Case No. 25-mc-00110-DKW-WRP

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

On April Fools Day (April 1, 2025), Helen Gundran (Gundran), purportedly as the trustee of a Family Trust, filed a self-described “Deed of Rescission” and paid to the Court a \$52 filing fee, which is the amount necessary to initiate a “miscellaneous” proceeding. Dkt. Nos. 1-2.

The “Deed of Rescission” states that a “quitclaim deed” from 2001 is an alleged “fraud”, contains a “forge[d]” signature, and declares the quitclaim deed as void. Dkt. No. 1 at 1. Other than documents allegedly “back[ing]” the “Deed of Rescission”, nothing else has been filed.

In this light, while there are numerous deficiencies with the “Deed of Rescission”, among other things, noticeably missing is a jurisdictional basis for the Court to hear any matter related to the quitclaim deed or even to act as a repository

for Gundran’s documentation, as appears to have occurred. Therefore, **Gundran is ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE why this matter should not be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.** Put simply, this Court may only hear matters over which it has subject matter jurisdiction. *See Arbaugh v. Y&H Corp.*, 546 U.S. 500, 514 (2006) (explaining that subject matter jurisdiction “involves a court’s power to hear a case” and a court has an independent obligation to determine whether such jurisdiction exists) (quotation and citation omitted).


**Gundran may have until April 18, 2025 to file a response to this Order to Show Cause. Should Gundran fail to file a timely response, this matter will be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.**

The Clerk is instructed to mail this Order to Show Cause to: 3274 Akala Drive, Kihei, Hawaii.<sup>1</sup>

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 4, 2025 at Honolulu, Hawai‘i.



  
Derrick K. Watson  
Chief United States District Judge

---

<sup>1</sup>This is because the Kihei address is the only one provided on the documentation Gundran has deposited with the Court. Therefore, if the Kihei address is not Gundran’s address, which the Court recognizes may be the case, Gundran only has herself to blame for not receiving this Order to Show Cause and failing to provide her actual mailing address or any other contact information. *See* Local Rule 10.2(b) (requiring all documents for filing to contain, among other things, the address of the filer).